

So I think we are in reasonably good shape. The exit strategy is obviously to draw down our forces as the Iraqis are able to take control of the situation, and currently, in almost every military action, Iraqis are out in front. There are many areas of Iraq at the present time where there are no U.S. forces. Iraqi forces are totally in control, not a whole lot of those areas, but there are some. So the Iraqis are assuming more and more responsibility for their own protection. At the present time, there are 21,000 fewer Americans in Iraq than there were in January. So there has been some drawdown at the present time.

One of the wild card situations is the Sunnis. Recently, the Sunnis, it was reported, reached a resolution with the Shias and the Kurds as to their role in government. I think if that can be accomplished, then we are in reasonably good shape for a resolution.

A constitution will be written by August 15. It will be approved by October 15, and a new government will be elected on December 15.

So there is a strategy. Progress is being made. It is a very difficult situation. I really, truly believe all Members, both sides of the aisle, are very much in support of our troops. I think it is important that we support them with our votes, with money, with equipment, and also with our words, because our words that are spoken on this House floor and in the press certainly reverberate around the world and al Jazeera.

So I know our troops very much are hoping that we will show unqualified and tremendous resolution in resolving this issue.

#### INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION AND THE GROKSTER DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Supreme Court, in a unanimous 9-0 decision, held that peer-to-peer file-swapping companies can be held liable if they promote the use of their sites to infringe copyright. The Grokster decision is a victory for all law-abiding Americans, especially the hardworking and talented individuals that make up our creative industries.

I am pleased that the Supreme Court struck the right balance between the protection of intellectual property and the desire to provide consumers with easy and lawful access to movies, music, and other content. Impressive advances in technology in recent years have produced a host of new and exciting avenues for consumers to access music and other content online. These new technologies, however, have also bred a culture of rampant pirating on the Internet.

Grokster and other peer-to-peer networks have become bastions of illegal

activity, providing safe havens for pirates to swap copied versions of copyrighted material without paying a cent. Every day, millions of copyrighted protected movies, songs, computer games, and other pieces of intellectual property are stolen over peer-to-peer networks.

The statistics speak for themselves. Over 90 percent of the file-sharing activity on Grokster is illegal copyright infringement. Of the music files available online, 99 percent are unauthorized, leading to a substantial drop in shipments of music to retailers.

In the last year alone, the number of feature films posted on file-sharing sites more than doubled to 44 million. Some estimates show that as many as 400,000 movies have been downloaded in one day alone.

Last month, it took just a few hours after the latest Star Wars movie opened in theaters for a copy to show up online on a file-sharing site. While so many Americans flocked to movie theaters across the country with their children and families to see the latest episode of this great Hollywood franchise, millions had access to an unauthorized copy of the film online, free for theft and the taking.

Our Nation's economy and creative industries that employ over 5 million Americans suffer a huge blow from the billions of dollars lost annually through illegal downloading. These networks that actively promote illegal activity continue to pose a serious threat to the livelihood of copyright creators and artists, many of whom live in my district.

One of our country's greatest exports, indeed the only area where we have a positive balance of trade with every Nation on earth, is in the area of creative content and our intellectual property, which is derived from the hard work of song writers, technicians, artists, programmers, musicians, independent filmmakers and scores of others who make their living from the lawful sale of these items.

The Supreme Court decision today strikes the right balance by protecting copyright holders from such illegal activity and promoting legal avenues for downloading movies, music, and other works by consumers.

Very simply, the Court decision today codifies an age-old principle: that one man should not profit from the fruit of another man's labor.

As the Court noted, their decision leaves breathing room for innovation, and a vigorous commerce and does nothing to compromise the legitimate commerce or discourage innovation having a lawful purpose.

Today's ruling upholds the principle that technology must and should advance, but not without respecting copyright law. Just moments after today's decision, a new legal peer-to-peer model was unveiled that will incorporate many user benefits common to the peer-to-peer file-sharing experience, and a number of sites have al-

ready been launched that offer Internet music downloads at affordable prices without infringing on copyright laws. These positive efforts provide a victory for both consumers and artists.

Today's decision will further encourage and spur even more technological innovation. As a result, consumers will be the ultimate winners as they will have more access to high-quality music, film, and other content on the Internet and elsewhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### BRINGING TROOPS HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as the right honorable gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), a good friend, former coach, had indicated, there are Members of this body who believe the solution in Iraq is to set a date certain by which we will begin removing or have our troops removed from Iraq. When asked recently if such a strategy would not have been devastating if used in World War II and would not have left Hitler in power, one Congressman said, well, World War II is not really an appropriate comparison. He believed the more appropriate model was that of Vietnam, where we set a time and then we got out.

I do not question anyone's motive here, but for freedom's sake, what in the world kind of a mission is that? The retreat from Vietnam created a vacuum that was filled by dead and mutilated bodies of those we ran out and deserted, and it is one of our darkest and most heinous hours in American history. It is rivaled, however, for its humiliating nature by the very war in Vietnam itself in which we sent soldiers to fight but tied one arm behind their backs and did not give them the equipment and backing to actually win. They were not authorized to win. They were told to just hold what they had. No war can ever be won unless there is a commitment by the government to win.

If we did not learn anything from the wars of the 20th century, it would be obvious here, but in 1979, we had an attack on American soil. That is what it is when someone attacks an American

embassy, and they took hostages of our diplomats and we did nothing. We failed to defend our soil and our people and our diplomats and a terrible message went forward.

□ 2015

We failed to address the attacks properly of the first bombing of the World Trade Center and on the U.S.S. *Cole* and other attacks.

We have sent a terribly erroneous message in the past that America does not have the courage or the stomach to complete the defense of ourselves or to finish what we start. That is what Osama bin Laden has been saying for years. If we just keep attacking, keep up the insurgency, America does not have the stomach to win. We will wear them down.

And now I hear colleagues verifying they do not have the stomach to complete what we started. My colleagues, when I was in Iraq in March, one former general under Saddam looked me in the eyes, a Sunni, and said, If the U.S. will just stay behind us and back us until we get our constitution and have the next election, you will see most of the violence in Iraq stop. The terrorists know how critical it is that this battle go on. They know that if freedom and a free society take hold in Iraq, in a Muslim country in the Middle East, they lose.

Some of the people who now are calling for a date certain to withdraw are some of the same people in 1991 who screamed at former President Bush, stop, stop, do not attack, they are surrendering. Get out. Do not go to Baghdad. And shortly after that, after he did as they implored, they said well, he is just too weak. He did not have the stomach to finish what he started. He was a weak President. He should have done what he started and gone on to Baghdad. Now they are doing the same thing to this President. I thank God he has the backbone to stay in there.

Please, I would encourage my colleagues to not push for a date certain. It would not have worked in World War II or in any war. It tells the opponents, the enemy, that we do not have the stomach to stay in there. We have a plan. We are training policemen, we are training soldiers. They will be able to defend themselves. Let us ensure that Iraq will win the peace and that the terrorists lose.

#### SUPREME COURT DECISION ON MGM V. GROKSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Kuhl of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. Schiff), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Linda T. Sánchez), and a colleague who wanted to be here as well

but could not be, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Bono), to react to a unanimous decision that came down today by the Supreme Court in the *MGM v. Grokster* case.

That ruling is a victory for American innovation. Artists will thrive, be encouraged to create the music and movies we love, and legitimate technology companies that distribute those same movies and music will no longer have to compete with piracy profiteers. Conversely, services that breed a culture of contempt for intellectual property will have to answer for their ill-gotten gains.

In addition to providing us with movies, sound recordings, computer games and software, books and other creative works, the core copyright industry accounts for over 6 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product. Businesses that rely on copyright employ more than 11 million U.S. workers. Unfortunately, the copyright piracy taking place over peer-to-peer networks has become a great threat to the livelihoods of all copyright creators. Therefore, robust protection for creativity is necessary to support everyone from the most famous artists to the completely unknown set designer, from shareholders and executives of studios and R&D record companies and software companies to the many thousands of hourly-wage earners who work for them.

Piracy robs creators and owners of sound recordings and movies of their right to be first in the market. But most harmful, peer-to-peer networks have created a culture where too many consumers, including our children, are accustomed to receiving their choice of entertainment anytime, anyplace, in any format for free, without providing the creator his or her rightful compensation.

In a 9-0 opinion, the Supreme Court has told businesses that facilitate copyright infringement that they will be held directly accountable for their actions. A business cannot model its success on the destruction of another's industry. To paraphrase Justice Kennedy's observation in the oral argument, unlawful expropriated property cannot be used by a business as part of its start-up capital.

This decision "does nothing to compromise legitimate commerce or discourage innovation having lawful promise." It has merely found a balance between the legitimate demand of copyright owners for effective protection and the rights of others to engage in substantially unrelated areas of commerce. Just because the transmission of these files happened in the ether, does not mean that the protection should only be symbolic. Just because we are in a digital age, the definition of stealing does not change. If I go to a store and take a CD without paying for it, I am stealing. If I go to a peer-to-peer network and download a song for free, I am also stealing.

The Supreme Court has instructed businesses: "You may not entice indi-

viduals to commit a moral and legal wrong." It is willing to hold businesses responsible for the part they play in promoting theft. It has issued a loud warning that companies will not be allowed to gain from illegal distribution. Those that specifically design their business models to target the demand for copyright infringement will be stuck wearing the bulls-eye.

Shed no tears: these illegitimate peer-to-peer networks are not innovators; they are free riders. Their services make it hard to teach our children about right and wrong. They send adware, spyware, viruses, and pornography on to our computers and into our homes. There are a great many reasons for parents, teachers, creators, and others to rejoice about the message the Supreme Court sent today.

Both the content and tech industry must continue developing innovative and legitimate ways to distribute content so that consumers can access entertainment on a variety of devices. This decision will improve opportunities for legitimate music and movie distribution, putting out of business the black marketeers.

This decision has provided greater protection for intellectual property rights and has provided the tools to effectively combat copyright theft. In turn, it will keep an engine of America's economic growth thriving by promoting innovation and creativity in entertainment and the arts. The decision is also a win for legitimate technology companies. Those who have structured their businesses to distribute content in innovative and legal ways that compensate the creator while providing consumers quality in choice should laud this decision.

The Founding Fathers dealt with pirates on the high seas and had the intuition to address the pirates over the air. They afforded protection in the Constitution for intellectual property rights that serve as the cornerstone of American innovation. The Supreme Court today has helped carry out the mission of article I section 8 of the Constitution by promoting the progress of science and the useful arts.

#### MGM V. GROKSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would join with my colleagues about today's unanimous decision by the Supreme Court in *MGM v. Grokster*, for it represents a great triumph for American creativity and innovation. File-sharing companies that actively coax consumers into violating copyright laws can no longer escape legal consequences under the guise of fair use. They will no longer be able to rip off from the talent and the hard work of our Nation's creators. In ruling for our Nation's creative artists, the Supreme Court today struck a proper balance